श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: कल मैं यहां नहीं हूं।

उपसभापति: आपके लिए हाऊस ज्यादा जरूरी है कि घर जाना ज्यादा जरूरी है? अगर आप इस चीज के महत्व को मानते हैं तो आप रुकिए।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह: मेरी मीटिंग है लखनऊ में ..(व्यवधान)

उपसभापति: एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स मिनिस्टर साहब, आप बोलिए।

Now, the External Affairs Minister will make his statement. *(Interruptions)*. Please sit down. Please do not disturb. There is a procedure. *(Interruptions)*.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Bofors Investigations

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI MADHAVSINH SOLANKI): Madam Deputy Chairman, with your permission, I make this statement.

I have read the report which has appeared in a newspaper today. I wish to make a brief statement clarifying my position.

Neither the Ministry of External Affairs nor I deal with the Bofors' investigation. I am not aware of the details of the pending proceedings. Hence, there was no occasion for me to make any request to the authorities in Switzerland in respect of the cases before the Swiss Courts and I categorically state that I have not done so.

However, it is true that when I was in Davos, I made a courtesy call on Mr. Felber, Federal Councillor for Foreign Affairs. At the end of our conversation, while taking his leave, I handed over a note to Mr. Felber. This note on the status of the court cases pending in Inuia had been given to me by a lawyer. I now regret that I handed over this note which has caused embarrassment to me and avoidable misunderstanding.

The Government of India's position has been made amply clear by the letters written by the CBI to the Swiss authorities. On these aspects, I understand that a statement will be made on behalf of the Government in due course. Thank you.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY): Madam Deputy Chairperson,..... *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): We are going to have a discussion on Bofors this week. Whatever clarifications hon. Members have ....*(Interruptions)*. If they feel so, it is all right.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is an observation, not a directive.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Madam, the statement of the Foreign Affairs Minister has rendered the confusion worse confounded. I have not only been confounded; I must confess, I have been astounded and dumbfounded. The statement is full of apparent and blatant contradictions. I am not using other words, for, they might be considered unparliamentary. The Minister should have told us about the talks and the note he has so quietly passed on to his counterpart in Switzerland. He has not cared, may I add dared, to mention the name of the lawyer. Will the Minister be able to tell us about the connection of the lawyer to the Minister, about the lawyer's connection to the Government? I may also find out from the Foreign Affairs Minister as to whether when he was confronted with this fact of a five-page note, he denied this to the 'Indian Express' because the 'Indian Express' which carries this report mentions the fact that you had denied this totally. Which of it is true? Is that denial true or is the statement true? What does this note contain? That is the most important thing. Was it mentioned in the note that the Government of Switzerland should go slow? Did the note say that having regard to the fact that the writ petition of Mr. Win Chadha is pending in the Delhi High Court, the Government of Switzerland should not take any further notice of this case? Did the Minister come to know of the report that appeared in the 'Indian Express' two days back that the Police Chief of Switzerland—Mr. Schmid, — told the press that the Government of India have instructed the Government of Switzerland not to be too much bothered about this case? There has been a reference to this. Why did not the

[Shri S. Jaipal Reddy]

Minister come forward with a clarification at that stage? The Prime Minister went to Davos in connection with the World Economic Summit. The Prime Minister should have gone with the Finance Minister, with the Commerce Minister.

Why did the Minister of External Affairs go and why did he go to Davos two days earlier? Why did so many things relating to Bofors happen during his stay at Davos? I would like to know from the Minister of External Affairs whether the Minister of External Affairs is nothing more than a courier of a private lawyer. This note was deadly serious. Its purpose was apparently mischievous. Now that the note has shot to surface, now that he has been caught with his hands in the till and now that he has been caught red-handed, he is trying to wriggle out of the situation through quibbling, prevarication, half-truths, if not untruths. Now that the Minister is afraid. He is trying to stage a somersault. The only thing is that somersault is being clearly seen. Is not the Foreign Minister guilty of gross misdemeanour? How could the Foreign Minister of a country pass on a note of a private lawyer to his counterpart in Switzerland? Is this not an example of outrageous, obnoxious conduct of the Ministry of External Affairs? The Minister, of course, expressed regret. I only regret to note that the regret apart from being formal, appears dishonest and disingenuous and this note which has now come to light is a positive, ultimate and clinching proof of the malevolent motives of this Government. The motive of the Government has all along been to scuttle, sabotage and bury the Bofors investigation through devious and if necessary, blatant methods. This, of course, is a blatant method. I think, for all this, a formal expression of regret is far from sufficient. Will the Minister be good enough to resign? I demand resignation. Nothing less than that will meet the ends of justice on this occasion.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (West Bengal): Madam, frankly speaking, I shall deem myself fortunate because I have never found such a misbehaviour on the part of a Minister during my stay in Parliament for the last several years. I call it a misconduct. The conduct of the Foreign Minister is a misconduct and it can be described as a total violation of the norms and the established procedure. I regret to say that I feel embarrassed because this is my Government, Government representing my people, my country. I regret to say that his behaviour tentamounts to lowering of the dignity of the office he holds. I regret that such an indignity can be inflicted on a Government that rules the country on popular mandate. This is not an indignity of the person, it is an indignity of the office. It is an indignity of the nation. Why do I say so? Madam, whatever may be the reasons for a Minister carrying the note of a private lawyer and whatever might have been the contents, neither I know the contents nor I know the reason for carrying a note, but the simple fact that the note of a private lawyer was carried by the Minister and that too was delivered by him while making a so-called courtesy call to his counterpart, gives much more respectability than what the Minister thinks to be. It cannot have been that innocuous. If it had been innocuous, it could have been straightway sent, it could have been mailed by the person who is the maker of the note to the person or to the authority to whom it would have been sent. The very fact that it was not sent, but it was preferred to be carried by a Minister and that too by a Foreign Minister and that too when he was a member of the delegation of which the Prime Minister was the leader, all these elements contribute to the fact that the note was not that innocuous. Therefore, the simple and innocuous regret cannot be the escape route for the Foreign Minister. It cannot have been that innocuous. Therefore, the Parliament cannot give him an escape route. He owes an explanation. He owes an explanation as to why he carried that note. He simply says, "I carried the note." But I want the explanation as to why he carried the note.

Thirdly, what has happened? What is the sequence of the events? The things that have happened are like this. After the note is delivered, the note is sent by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of that country to the Ministry of Justice and after receiving that note, carried by the Foreign Minister, they decided to go

slow. That is the complaint. It is the sequence? And as a result of the instruction that it should go slow, the CBI which had been the investigating agency postponed the visit. This was all in darkness. There would have been no statements, there would have been no word of regret, there would have been no asking of questions, if these facts had not come to the surface. I congratulate the journalism, the investigative journalism, that it has brought the facts to light, and since it has brought the fact to light, they have started feeling something must be done to bury it, to bury the hatchet, to hide the intention. As a result, the CBI which has decided to cancel the visit subsequent to Ist of February jumps into action on the 25th and a message, a signal is sent that no note should be taken of that note. And we are equally serious about the investigation! Therefore, what is the mysterious connection between the visit of the Foreign Minister, handing over of the note and the sudden suspension of activity on the part of the Swiss Authorities and the suspension of activities on the part of the investigating agency in India? Why do I feel humiliated? Because I think this note can be produced to the court. Just imagine, Madam, if this note can be produced to the court. Just imagine, Madam, if this note is produced to a court in Switzerland, where does the country stand? It is not the Bofors scandal that has maligned the nation, but if it come to light that a Foreign Minister carried a note and the note wanted to delay the whole process in the name of stating the present status of the case in India and as a result of that it was delayed, Madam, if it comes to light, if it is presented to the court,—what happens to Solanki, I don't mind; one Solanki can come and go—what happens to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, what happens to the Council of Ministers, what happens to our Parliamentary democracy, what happens to our tradition? This is much more than the Bofors scandal. If somebody wants to hide something, and that too a person holding a high office, and that too representing the Government of India, if it comes to light, what happens to our own dignity, Madam, you just tell me. You just tell me if it comes to light tommorrow or the day after...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You may put the question because it is very late....

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: My question is this. I would like to ask the Minister whether he feels scandalised. Only one question. Let him tell the House whether he feels scandalised because of the revelation of the fact, not regret; whether he feels scandalised. Therefore, I was just saying that if it comes to light, the whole Indian nation stands scandalised because everybody belonging to other nations will say, here is a nation, here is a Government which has produced a Minister who comes to influence the process of justice, just to 7.00 P.M.

> hide the crime of another. People will point their fingers at the people in power in India and the whole image of India will be tarnished. Each and every Indian will feel as if he is a part of the scandal, he is a part of the cover-up. It is my dignity as an Indian, it is my dignity as a Member of Parliament, it is my dignity being the torch-bearer of the heritage of Nehru and Gandhi that is tarnished. I believe, if it had happened when Nehru was in power, there would have been no such statement. There would have been only a one-line notification from the Rashtrapati Bhavan that Mr. Solanki has resigned and Rashtrapati has accepted his resignation. This would not have happened if Mr. Nehru was there. Unfortunately that Indian legacy has been given a go-by too. Therefore, I would like to ask the Foreign Minister only one thing, whether he feels that in such a case he should step down voluntarily to keep the standard of normal behaviour of the Minister untarnished; whether he believes it is a scandal; whether he believes what he has done is a violation. My last question in respect of this whole controversy is whether he feels that he should silently go out.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN (West Bengal): Madam, really this evening we have come across a very pitiable, scandalous and disgraceful episode concerning not only the conduct of our

[Shri Sukomal Sen]

Foreign Minister but the entire Government. I will seek only certain clarifications. When the Foreign Minister is visiting Switzerland it is natural for him to meet his counterpart. But all of a sudden our Foreign Minister putting a note in the hands of the Swiss Foreign Minister is something unimaginable. What is that note? He has not mentioned what that note is. He has stated, "a note concerning court cases". Court cases about what? What is that note? First of all, Madam, I demand that note must be placed on the Table of the House so that we can know the contents of that note.

Secondly, Madam, about the lawyer who prepared that note. The note was prepared by a lawyer. Who is that lawyer? Is he a private lawyer or a Government lawyer? For whom is he pleading? Why has he prepared that note and how has he sent it to Switzerland? So, we want identification of that lawyer.

My third question is whether this episode has taken place without the knowledge of the Prime Minister. Then the Prime Minister also owes a responsibility to the House. If it has happened with the knowledge of the Prime Minister then also he owes a responsibility to the House. If it has happened without the knowledge of the Prime Minister then also he owes a responsibility to the House as to how his Foreign Minister could do such a thing in a foreign country.

Madam, in this situation, in this most disgraceful situation, I feel that the Government is indulging in a hide-and-seek business behind the back of the Parliament which is bringing down the image of the country. In this situation, I fully agree with Mr. Reddy that our foreign Minister has no moral right to continue in office after this scandalous episode. So, the note should be placed on the Table of the House; identification of the lawyer should be made and the Prime Minister should come and explain the situation how his Foreign Minister could do such a thing and whether it has been done with his knowledge or without his knowledge.

PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairman, it is no use to use harsh words but it may be said that this is a situation which is in many respects unprecedented even in the chequered history of independent India. Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta has said that during his career in this House—my career also is not much shorter—we have never come across this type of a statement.

As a student of History I can say that even in the history of Independent India this type of example is unprecedented. Madam, this is the statement from the External Affairs Minister. He is supposed to guide the diplomats. Has he shown any diplomacy in what he narrates here? First about the note, I don't know whether he is a private lawyer or not, so long as he does not identify him but I think after he has stated this fact he has three responsibilities. First is to identify the lawyer. Second is to identify the contents. Third is to intimate the House. Whether he took his Prime Minister into confidence in the matter. He says, "I regret, I have come to regret." Well, he begins by saying that the External Affairs Ministry is not concerned with the details of the Bofors case. Why, without knowing the details of the Bofors case, a note concerning the Bofors case changed hands through him? It ought to be clarified. Not to speak of External Affairs Minister, no Minister or perhaps no respectable citizen agrees to do such a thing without knowing the significance of it. What was in the note? Why did he dare to give it to the External Affairs Minister of that country? Has that lawyer some catch—as it is said "Catch 22"—on the external Affairs Minister or on the Government of India? Is there any such provision, a provision which we did never suspect in spite of many scandals including the scandal on Bofors? All tall talk just to try to slow down the pace of inquiry. Therefore, the External Affairs Minister owes us answers to these three questions and to say whether the first paragraph of the statement agrees with rest of the statement.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM (Andhra Pradesh): Madam, this is really a very unfortunate issue which we are discussing in this House. As I go through the statement, I feel really sorry for Mr. Solanki. Either he must have done it knowing fully well the consequences, the

implications of such act or he must have been made a sacrificial goat by somebody who is really interested in scuttling the investigation process in the Bofors case. Either way he is guilty of great indiscretion. I don't want to use harsher words because he is so gentle and so innocent looking. I must have some consideration for him. It is a most unfortunate thing that a Foreign Minister of this country handed over a packet of papers or a note or whatever it is to another Foreign Minister without knowing the contents of it. It really beats me. Not only any Member of Parliament, but not even any responsible citizen or informed citizen of the country will believe that the Foreign Minister had handed over a note, a packet given by a lawyer to his counterpart in Switzerland without knowing its contents. It is really a most unfortunate thing. There is absolutely no point in hiding the facts. Facts are facts. Since that time the Government came into power, the news has been circulating in the country that the Government is not serious in prosecuting or in unravelling the truth about the Bofors scandal. In this background, if either the Foreign Minister or the Prime Minister goes all the way to Switzerland and does this kind of a thing, it really creates suspicions among the people, among the entire country. Therefore, what I suggest is, let the Foreign Minister—whether he remains to be the Foreign Minister or not, that is a different thing—give up his individual status and stature in Indian politics. Let him come out with all the truth and let him share his information with the House. Threre is another thing. It appeared in the Press that the Hindujas who are the prime suspect in the entire Bofors scandal are meeting him and he has been talking to them. They are running around him. That appeared in the Press. So he has to explain to this House whether he had met those Hindujas or any of those suspects who are alleged to have been involved in the Bofors scandal. Did he meet all those people at Davos in Switzerland? He should also name the lawyer who gave him the packet. That is a most important thing. Can the Foreign Minister be reduced to the level of a courier? He should come out with the information regarding the name of the lawyer, the contents of the letter, who made him to transmit this note to his counterpart in Switzerland. It is better for his personal prestige and personal status that he should come out with all the truth and share his views with the House. Otherwise, the only alternative is that he should resign and be done with it. Under these circumstances, I believe that either he should come out with all the truth, whatever he knows, or he has to resign and get out of the Government. This is the only alternative, as a gentleman, Mr. Solanki has. Thank you, Madam.

श्री प्रमोद महाजन (महाराष्ट्र): उपसभापति महोदया, गत 5 वर्षों से इस सदन में हम बोफोर्स कांड की चर्चा कर रहे हैं। लगता यह है कि प्रतिक्षण कुछ लोग इस जांच को रोकने का निरंतर प्रयास कर रहे हैं। मैं लम्बे भाषण के लिए यहां नहीं खड़ा हूं। जब यह चर्चा शुरू हुई तो पहले यहां कहा गया कि इसमें बिचौलिया है ही नहीं। फिर कहा गया कि बिचौलिया तो है लेकिन उसको कमीशन नहीं दी, वाइंडिग अप चार्जेज दिये। फिर कहा गया कि वाइंडिग अप चार्जेज नहीं हमने कमीशन दिया। फिर कहा गया कि हमने कमीशन नहीं दिया, घूस दी। फिर कहा गया कि घूस किसी को दी है, लेकिन किसको दी वह पता नहीं। अगर हम इन पांच वाक्यों को पांच वर्षों में जोड़ लें तो लगता यह है कि वर्तमान सरकार, सत्तारूढ़ दल हर क्षण पर यह प्रयास करता रहा कि बोफोर्स की चोरी में कौन चोर है यह सत्य दुनियां के सामने कभी न आए। लगता यह है कि आज विदेश मंत्री का यह कृत्य उसी श्रंखला की एक कड़ी है और बोफोर्स की जांच का सत्य छिपाने का एक और प्रयास है।

विदेश मंत्री जी अपने वक्तव्य में कहते है कि मैंने उनसे विदा लेते समय एक नोट उनके हाथ में दिया। इतनी बचकानी बात दूसरी नहीं हो सकती है। अगर बचकानी बात ही करनी होती तो मैं उनको सुझाव देता हूं कि वे यह लिखते कि नोट तो मैं देने वाला था नहीं, मेरे हाथ में नोट था, शेक हैंड करते समय बाई मिस्टेक एक्सचेंज हो गया। मैंने तो नोट देना नहीं था, वह तो अपने लिए मैंने रखा था लेकिन मैं क्या करूं शेक हैंड करते समय मेरे हाथ से फिसल गया और उनके हाथ में चला गया। इस रिडीकुलस लेविल पर आप सदन को जानकारी देंगे कि मैंने एक नोट दिया, किसी वकील ने मुझे दिया था। नोट में क्या लिखा था मुझे पता नहीं। जब मैं निकल रहा था तो मुझे

[श्री प्रमोद महाजन]

अचानक याद आया कि पता नहीं वह शादी का निमंत्रण था क्या था। उस समय मुझे उसमें कुछ पता नहीं था।

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY): The Minister nowhere said that he was not aware of the contents of the letter. The Minister didn't say that. I would like the honourable Member to note this.

श्री प्रमोद महाजन: और जब यह कहा जाता है कि एक नोट दी... **(व्यवधान)**

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: Nowhere did he say that he knew the contents of the letter.

श्री प्रमोद महाजन: तो मैं मंत्री महोदय से पहला प्रश्न यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या उन्होंने उस नोट को सरसरी, थोड़ा सा, ऊपर से, 2-4 सेंटेंस, कुछ देखे हैं? क्या नोट में यह लिखा है कि जब तक भारत के न्यायालय में विन चड्ढा पर जो केस चल रहा है उसका निर्णय न आए तब तक स्विस न्यायालय में आगे कोई कार्यवाही न की जाए, क्योंकि विन चड्ढा पर जो केस है, अभी वह बोर्ड पर ही नहीं आया है। अगर बोर्ड पर आ जाए तो 5-10 वर्षों की तो हिसाब इस पूरे केस में रुकता है और एक विदेश मंत्री के द्वारा गई नोट बोफोर्स के इस रहस्य को 10 वर्ष तक छुपा सकती है। इसलिए मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि इस नोट में जो लिखा गया है कि भारत के न्यायलय में लंबित सारे जो भी कोर्ट केसेज़ हैं इनका निर्णय होने के पहले स्विस न्यायालय में कोई कार्यवाही न की जाए, ऐसा नोट में लिखा गया है? मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या विदेश मंत्री को यह पता है कि इस नोट के ये कंटेंट्स हैं? उसके साथ-साथ मैं यह पूछना चाहूंगा कि यह नोट देने का जब वह भारत से वकील की ओर से नोट लेकर गए हैं तो निश्चित रूप से उन्होंने सोचा था कि इस नोट को मुझे उनके विदेश मंत्री को देना है, तो मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि सरकारी तौर पर एक कागज़, एक विदेश मंत्री दूसरे विदेश मंत्री को जब देता है तो क्या केन्द्रीय मंत्रिपरिषद् के सामने यह नोट आई थी? क्या केन्द्रीय मंत्री परिषद् ने इस नोट पर विचार किया था या ऐसी किसी समिति ने किया था कि जिस विचार के बाद आपने यह दिया हो? उसके साथ-साथ, मेरे और साथियों के साथ मैं यह पूछना चाहूंगा क्योंकि स्वाभाविक रूप में इसमें तो केवल दो ही महत्वपूर्ण बातें हैं कि इसके लिए कौन था जो सलाह दे रहा था, जो नोट दे रहा था? और मुझे समझ में आज तक यह नहीं आया कि उस देश के विदेश मंत्री को यहां का एक वकील, अपने विदेश मंत्री के द्वारा नोट भेजे। इसका मतलब तो यह वकील हिन्दुस्तान का सब से बड़ा वकील होना चाहिये कि जिसकी नोट वहां का विदेश मंत्री इंतज़ार कर रहा है थ्रू आवर फारेन मिनिस्टर। मतलब वहां के विदेश मंत्री को हमारे विदेश मंत्री के हाथ से, यह कोई मामूली वकील तो हो नहीं सकता, यह तो बहुत बड़ा वकील होना चाहिये कि जिसकी नोट ले जाने वाला विदेश मंत्री है, लेने वाला स्विस का विदेश मंत्री है? दो विदेश मंत्रियों के पास भेजने वाला यह वकील ...**(व्यवधान)**

श्री गुरुदास दासगुप्त: एक मिनट, मेहरबानी, मंत्री जी बताएं कि यह किसका वकील था? सरकार का वकील था या कोई एक्यूज्ड का वकील था? किसका वकील था? Who was this lawyer? For whom was the lawyer holding the brief? I assume that he was a lawyer for the Government.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta, you had your say. Please let him speak. It is already 7.15.

श्री प्रमोद महाजन: मैडम, इसके लिए कोई भी हो, लेकिन निश्चित रूप से यह है, कोई एक छोटा वकील तो हो नहीं सकता कि जिसके नोट का इंतजार वहां के लिए विदेश मंत्री करता हो, जिसकी नोट विदेश मंत्री ले जाता हो। मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा कि यह वकील कौन था? इन सारे स्पष्टीकरणों के बाद भी मैं एक बात स्पष्ट करना चाहता हूं कि जिस प्रकार यह घटना हुई है कोई भी दूसरा स्वाभिमानी विदेश मंत्री होता तो यहां आकर केवल यह कहे कि मुझे इस बात का अफसोस है, मुझे लगता है यह केवल अफसोस का काम नहीं है, इस पर किसी भी स्वाभिमानी व्यक्ति को शर्म आनी चाहिये कि मेरे काम के कारण मेरे देश की बदनामी हुई मेरी सरकार की बदनामी हुई और न्यायिक जांच में मेरे कारण किसी न किसी प्रकार की, अगर इस प्रकार का व्यवधान खड़ा होता है तो मैं समझता हूं कि ऐसे विदेश मंत्री को एक क्षण भी अपने पद पर रहने का अधिकार नहीं है और इसलिए वह स्पष्टीकरण तो नया विदेश मंत्री दे तो अच्छा होगा। मैं तो विदेश मंत्री से यह मांग करना चाहूंगा और विरोधी दल के सभी नेता सहित, सब लोगों ने जो मंत्री के त्याग-पत्र की मांग की है, मैं इस मांग को दोहराना चाहता हूं। और मैं स्पष्टीकरण के रूप में भी यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि इतना शर्मनाक काम करने के बाद क्या विदेश मंत्री यह बता सकते हैं कि वह इस विदेश मंत्रालय के लायक हैं?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any clarifications from this side?...*(Interruptions)*...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Madam, this is for the first time that

nobody from the ruling party side is seeking clarifications...*(Interruptions)*... This is for the first time...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN (TamilNadu): You ask your clarifications...*(Interruptions)*...We don't have any need....*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA (Bihar): We have no need to seek clarifications...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): You ask your clarifications...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order, please...*(Interruptions)*...

उपसभापति: मैं तो हमेशा ही कोशिश करती हूं कि कम क्लेरिफिकेशंस हों। आप क्यों चाह रहे हैं कि इधर से भी लोग पूछें? और समय लगेगा।

श्री प्रमोद महाजन: ऐसे दो-चार मंत्री ले आओ तो स्पष्टीकरण की जरुरत ही नहीं रहेगी।

विदेश मंत्री (श्री माधव सिंह सोलंकी): मैंने जो अपना स्टेटमेंट किया है, वह स्टेटमेंट आफ फैक्ट्स है। जो हुआ है, वहीं मैंने बताया है। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर (उत्तर प्रदेश): यह फैक्ट है?

उपसभापति: वह बता रहे हैं न। माथुर साहब सुनने दीजिए।

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): You hear what the Minister has to say....*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MADHAVSINH SOLANKI: I have said whatever happened. वह जो हुआ, वह मैंने यहां बताया है। मैं माननीय सदस्यों के साथ सहमत हूं कि यह जो हुआ है, वह गलत है, नहीं होना चाहिये था। And I have accepted that and I have regretted for that...*(Interruptions)* ...कि एक वकील ...**(व्यवधान)**... जी कह रहे हैं कि इंडिया से कोई ब्रीफिंग लेकर नहीं गए थे...**(व्यवधान)**...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Name?...*(Interruptions)* ...

SHRI MADHAVSINH SOLANKI: Unfortunately, I do not remember the name...*(Interruptions)* ...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: That is also bad...*(Interruptions)* ...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Madam, this is terrible... *(Interruptions)*.... Madam, the Foreign Minister carries a letter and he does not know the name of the person to whom he gives the letter or of the person from whom he carries the letter.... *(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta, when you were asking for clarifications and levelling charges, the Minister did not say a word. He was Just sitting and listending to you. So, you please listen to him now... *(Interruptions)*... When you were speaking, the Minister did not speak a word. Now, let him finish. He has not finished yet. Has he sat down after giving his clarification or explanation? Please sit down... *(Interruptions)*.....Do not behave like this.

श्री माधव सिंह सोलंकी: मेरी बात तो सुन लीजिए। ...**(व्यवधान)**... जब हम गए और जहां मि० फेलबर को मिलने जा रहे थे, जहां ये लॉयर मिला ....*(Interruptions)*.....I am fully accountable to this August House. There is no question about that...Madam, what I am narrating is what really happened....*(Interruptions)*....जिसमें उन्होंने कहा कि यह पेंडिंग केसेज के बारे में मेरा नोट है, वह आप पहुंचा दीजिए He said, "I have a certain representation to make." In a hurry, when I went there, मैंने वह उनको दिया। अब इसके सिवाय उस वकील का नाम क्या है, वह भी मुझे याद नहीं है और मैंने वह पूरा पढ़ा भी नहीं था। महाजन साहब ने पूछा कि मैंने पूरा पढ़ा था कि नहीं? मैंने वह पूरा पढ़ा भी नहीं था। और ऊपर से देख लिया कि क्या है?...**(व्यवधान)**... I have stated in my statement that this pertains to pending cases ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: What type of cases? Divorce cases?

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: Which cases? ..*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MADHAVSINH SOLANKI: This is about the Bofors case...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: That is the point, Madam... *(Interruptions)*...

श्री माधव सिंह सोलंकी: तो इसके लिए मैंने क्षमा भी मांग ली है कि यह गलती हुई है, लेकिन एक बात मैं सदन को साफ बता देना चाहता हूं कि Neither myself nor my Ministry has at all instructed the office to stop the cases or

[श्री माधव सिंह सोलंकी]

to impede the course of justice...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: What is there in that letter? That is the point...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Madam, will the honourable Minister kindly yield for a minute?... *(Interruptions)*....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him finish first ...*Interruptions)*... Mr. Reddy, let him finish first...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Madam, he has yielded.....*(Interruptions)*... The point is that whether they have a copy of the note. Does the Government have a copy of the note? If it does not have, will it ask our Embassy in Switzerland to get a copy from the Government of Switzerland, because it has been officially marked there?

SHRI MADHAVSINH SOLANKI: As I said, since I gave it to him, I have not got the copy. How can I have the copy? When I am taking a leter and giving it to somebody, how can I have the copy? मेरे पास कापी कैसे हो सकती है?

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: Can you name your lawyer? Is he a lawyer from India or is he a lawyer from Switzerland? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI MADHAVSINH SOLANKI: He was not a Government lawyer. He was a private lawyer. *(Interruptions)*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him finish what he wants to say. Please. You have asked about this letter. I can allow you, but not now. *(Interruptions)*

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर: क्या बोफोर्स के साथ संबंधित थे वकील? ...**(व्यवधान)**...

उपसभापति: माथुर साहब, उनकी बात पूरी होने दीजिए। ...**(व्यवधान)**... सुकोमल सेन जी मंत्री, जी की बात पूरी होने दीजिए...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर: बाद में क्या आप इजाजत देंगी?

उपसभापति: हां, मैं इजाजत दूंगी मगर बात तो पूरी होने दीजिए।...**(व्यवधान)**...

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: Is he an Indian or a foreign lawyer?

SHRI MADHAVSINH SOLANKI: Indian.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: Indian lawyer living in Switzerland?

SHRI MADHAVSINH SOLANKI: Yes. What I mean to say about the main question whether I or my Ministry have ever tried to stop the proceedings or investigations or impeded the course of justice, I categorically say that we have not done it. So there is nothing to bring shame to this country by the behaviour of my Ministry. The unfortunate thing is that I took the letter and gave it to him. That's all. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: We demand the resignation of the Foreign Minister. *(Inrterruptions)* What are you doing with this House? *(Interruptions)*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please. Just a minute. You asked a question. The Minister answered whatever he could answer. Now, we are going to have a discussion on Bofors. You can raise the issue there. *(Interruptions)*

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD): Madam, they wanted a statement. The hon. Minister has given the statement and the clarifications also. Second, we are having a full-fledged discussion. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: If the copy of the note is note available with the Minister...*(Interruptions)* He has completed the reply. Therefore, I am repeating my demand. A copy of the note is available with the Government of Switzerland. It has been officially marked. Therefore, our Embassy can approach the Govenment of Switzerland and obtain a copy. Will a copy be made available to the House tomorrow? Otherwise, we will not allow the House to function. *(Interruptions)*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You asked for clarifications. That is over. Now I have to make an announcement. *(Interruptions)* I have to make an announcement. There is something from the Lok Sabha to be reported. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: Can he ask the Indian Embassy to get back the note?

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह (बिहार): मैडम, यह बहुत गंभीर मामला है। .....**(व्यवधान)**.... विदेश मंत्री जी बोल रहे हैं, इतनी आसानी से यह काम हो नहीं सकता।.....**(व्यवधान)**....

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM:

If he really does not know the contents of the letter and if he does not believe that the letter contained any incriminating material.... he can as well bring it back from the Swiss Government through our Embassy in Switzerland. *(Interruptions)* He should give an assurance to the House.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: That copy must be provided or he must resign.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Message from the Lok Sabha. *(Interruptions)* If I don't allow it, we cannot have a discussion tomorrow. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: What will he do with the note? *(Interruptions)*

श्री अश्विनी कुमार (बिहार): बड़ा गंभीर मसला है ...**(व्यवधान)**...

उपसभापति: गंभीर मसला है इसीलिए अलाऊ किया है न इतनी देर तक। ....**(व्यवधान)**....

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह: आप खुद भारत के उपराष्ट्रपति के साथ कई बार जा चुकी हैं विदेशों में, क्या भारत का प्रतिनिधि इस तरह से कोई आसानी से ..... **(व्यवधान)**....काम करेगा। .....**(व्यवधान)**...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr Minister, you don't have anything to say? You have nothing more to say?

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: There was a pointed reply. They wanted the Minister to give...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Will you bring back the note?

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: They wanted a discussion in this House which the Government has agreed to have, a full-fledged discussion on Bofors on the 2nd. *(Interruptions)* There was a pointed demand whether the hon. Foreign Minister has handed over a note to another Minister, to which the Minister has said, 'yes'. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now the Message from the Lok Sabha. *(Interruptions)* Let me finish this.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

The Securities and Exchange Board of India Bill, 1992

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Madam, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha signed by the Secretary-General of the Lok Sabha:

> "In accordance with the provisions of rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose the Securities and Exchange Board of India Bill, 1992, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 30th March, 1992."

Madam, I lay a copy of the Bill on the Table.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have to make an announcement. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Will the Foreign Minister make a promise about the note? *(Interruptions)*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Just a minute. Before you, I asked the Minister if he has anything else to add, and he did not. So, I have to make an announcement. The Business Advisory Committee... *(Interruptions)* I have to do it. I have to make this announcement. *(Interruptions)*

ANNOUNCEMENT RE. EXTENSION OF CURRENT SESSION

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have to inform Members that the Business Advisory Committee at its meeting held today, the 30th March, 1992, recommended that the current Session of the Rajya Sabha be further extended by one more day and accordingly the House will meet on Friday, the 3rd April, 1992 and there would be no question hour on that day. *(Interruptions)*

Now, the House is adjourned till 11 o'clock tomorrow.

> The House then adjourned at thirty-four minutes past seven of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 31st March, 1992.